

RECEIVED

EIS000310

OCT 21 1999

6 MS. OLSEN: My name is Mary Olsen. I work
7 with Nuclear Information and Resource Service,
8 southeast office, near Augusta, Georgia. I am
9 speaking tonight for myself; I give the
10 identification for people's benefit.

11 But first I want to apologize. I was invited
12 to speak about these issues, because I worked on
13 them for a number of years in this area, night
14 before last; and at that time I didn't have the
15 numbers out of the EIS for the SRS shipments, the
16 Savannah River site shipments that would come
17 through Georgia. And so I was only talking about
18 2,500 to 2,600 shipments moving in Georgia as a
19 result of this program. But tonight we heard that
20 there's an additional 7,500 projected shipments,
21 which brings the projected total for the state of
22 Georgia closer to 10,000 shipments. So my
23 apologies to the citizens who did not get the full
24 story from me so far. So we're all learning here,
25 and I appreciate this opportunity to be learning.

|

1 I myself am a mother, I am a scientist, I am
2 an educator, I am a gardener -- practically a
3 subsistence farmer, I'd say -- and I am a
4 landowner and I am a driver. I live in Georgia.

5 1 I'm deeply concerned as a scientist about the
6 number of times the rules have been changed in the
7 Yucca Mountain project. It appears to me that the
8 political decision is being made to appear
9 acceptable on technical grounds. But I as a
10 scientist was trained that if a sample does not
11 meet a standard, you reject the sample, not the
12 standard. We know the Yucca Mountain standards
13 have been changed already. We also know that the
14 site cannot meet the current guidelines that DOE
15 itself has written, and we see no sign of the
16 Department of Energy doing anything except
17 proceeding with the project as if that were not
18 the case and perhaps trying to change those very
19 guidelines.

20 6... I'm shocked tonight to know that Wendy Dixon,
21 the head of this project, has not heard about
22 crustal expansion as published in Science
23 magazine, paid for in part by the Nuclear
24 Regulatory Commission, conducted by Cal Tech and
25 other scientists, peer reviewed. I'll certainly

6 personally send her a copy of that study. I have
a deep concern as a member of the community here
in Georgia about sending irradiated fuel generated
in this state to a site that could well have a
magma pocket below it. I don't think that's
responsible to the environment, to us or to the
future generations.

In five minutes you do have to talk fast, but
I am now speaking as a resident in a reactor
community. I don't live in Waynesboro, but I
don't live that far from it. I can tell you right
now that my point of view is that, the minute
casks start to roll, should they start to roll,
there will be one more, two more, thousands of
more radioactive waste sites. A storage facility
constitutes one more waste site because as long as
that reactor's open I know there's going to be
wastes at that site, minimum of five years
inventory. You're not getting rid of the waste in
my community, you're just spreading it around.

And I want to talk a little bit about the
2... spreading around. We've heard a quick mention
about the radiation that comes through the walls
of the container. I have a real concern about
living in a community where over 7,000 shipments

2

1 of nuclear waste are going to travel, Augusta,
2 when at ten chest X-rays an hour at the surface of
3 the container, or perhaps even full-body X-rays;
4 two meters out the official regulations allow one
5 X-ray an hour. I was in Atlanta night before last
6 when that big tie-up on I-85 happened. How many
7 hours did people sit in their cars? How many X-
8 rays would I have gotten? Someone flashed me the
9 information of four hours she sat in her car.
10 Okay? So someone sitting right next to a waste
11 cask in that tie-up would have perhaps received
12 the equivalent of four chest X-rays. But that's
13 if it's a standard man. Okay? So I'm not a
14 standard man. I'm a woman; I'm shorter. I do
15 have probably about the same body mass. But what
16 would my dose have been? What about my child?
17 How many times do you multiply it for a child?
18 And if I'm pregnant, what did my fetus, developing
19 child, just receive? Was I notified? Did I get to
20 choose that? Is it the same as medical X-rays?
21 No, it is not; I did not consent.

3...

22 So tonight I'm officially telling you,
23 Department of Energy, I do not consent to these
24 radioactive waste shipments. They are unwarranted
25 and unnecessary, going to a site that should have

3 | been disqualified. | At such time that there is a
1 |
2 | program that is taking this waste -- because I
3 | don't believe it will stay at the reactor sites
4 | for 10,000 years -- then we need to get good, long
5 | 4 (sic) and ready for how to handle it. | But the
6 | point is that 50 years of radioactive decay do
7 | make a difference for the issue I'm talking here
8 | tonight because either you can put more waste per
9 | container, in which case you cut down the number
10 | of shipments and cut down on the number of
11 | potential accidents because shipments are tied
12 | directly -- I mean accidents are tied directly to
13 | shipment miles, so fewer shipments is fewer
14 | accidents and fewer numbers of people who are
15 | exposed to this ongoing radiation.

16 | There goes my alarm, so I'll wind up. Or if
17 | we don't have a fewer number of shipments, we
18 | actually can have shielding that works and we
19 | don't have this incidental radiation. So let's
20 | look long and hard at what our choices are. We're
21 | still going to have waste at the reactor sites, in
22 | my community. We may move this waste. Will we
23 | move it 2,000 miles, each shipment? Is that
24 | really the best idea? People have been talking
25 | about the 30 years of shipping. Well, that's the

1 little league compared to the world series, if you
2 5 add up the shipment miles. | My last line is that I
3 agree a shipment from the reactor pool at Hatch to
4 the reactor pad at Hatch is a nuclear waste
5 shipment. But you're counting those as shipments
6 when you add up the number of shipments in the
7 last 30 years, and that's not a shipment compared
8 to a shipment to Yucca Mountain. So stop
9 comparing apples and oranges. | Get honest here,
10 and let's talk the real stuff because I intend to
11 live in this region for a long time and I
12 understand this is a real problem. But we're not
13 addressing it yet.

14 MR. LAWSON: Our next speaker is Valerie
15 Sipp. She'll be followed by Rita Kilpatrick and
16 Dana Powell.

6